



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,772	11/20/2001	Kenji Yamamoto	40004102-02	2069

7590 10/01/2002

Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

PREVIL, DANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2632

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002

60

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,772

Applicant(s)

YAMAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel Previl

Art Unit

2632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract should avoid using phrase like "means" in lines 2, 6, 7, 10, 12. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said information" there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1, the phrase "that can be" in line 6 is vague, indefinite and unclear for the examiner.

Claim 1, the phrase "communications device" in line 6 is unclear whether the Applicant refers to the same "communication device" in line 8 or another one.

Claims 2-9 are rejected for the same reason since they depend from a rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seeley et al. (US 6,069,655) in view of Vaio (US 6,271,752).

Regarding claims 1, 4, Seeley teaches several camera devices are installed for monitoring specified place (plurality of cameras located about a facility, both inside and out) (col. 6, lines 4-7); camera devices (cameras 14) constantly monitor for intruders in specified place (video security system performs a continuous surveillance which detects and reports intrusions of any premises) (col. 1, lines 28-32); intruder is detected and send an unusual status reporting

signal (reliably detects and reports intrusions of any premises to the central station) (col. 1, lines 24-39); and collects image data received in specified units (col. 6, lines 27-41; col. 9, lines 16-54).

Seeley fails to disclose a communications device that can be connected to camera devices and communication line including an Internet line, and a server means to be connected to communication device through Internet line means; communication device establishes communication with server means.

However, Vaios discloses a communication device (6) that can be connected to camera device (10) and communication line including an Internet line and a server means to be connected to communication device through Internet line means (video camera 10 connected to communications network 6 in order to establish connection 22 and communicate with one or more end user locations 8) (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 26-36); camera device can establish a connection with communication device (fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Vaios in Seeley. Doing so would detect accurately an intruder and notify immediately the authorities via a communications device such as a beeper, telephone or e-mail to prevent criminal activities.

Regarding claim 2, Seeley teaches image data corresponding to specified place are sent to server means and image data are automatically deleted (snapshots are discarded on a first in first out basis by buffer 40) (col. 13, lines 8-25).

Regarding claim 3, Seeley teaches image data include several items of image data obtained from one of multiple-camera devices at different times (when an intrusion is detected, SCU attributes more time to the camera that first detected the event and check all other cameras for any intruders at a reduce service rate) (col. 14, lines 40-53).

7. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seeley et al. in view of Vaios.

8. Regarding claims 5, 9, although, the above combination discloses all the limitations set forth in claim 1, but fails to specify a web site. Since, Vaios discloses the linking means can include the Internet with e-mail, permanently connected to the Internet (col. 4, lines 7-65). It is well known in the art to send quick and accurate information related to an intrusion unto the premises that can allow police to respond fast to apprehend the intruder. So, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a specified web site to send quick and

Art Unit: 2632

accurate information related to an intrusion detection onto the premises that can allow police to respond fast to apprehend the intruder.

9. Regarding claim 6, Seeley discloses a server reports to a terminal that has been registered in advance when image data has been received (video server at a central monitoring facility which video signals are routed to workstation) (col. 6, lines 27-41).

Regarding claim 7, the above combination discloses all the limitations in claim 1 and Vaio further discloses Internet line (fig. 1). Same motivation as claim 5.

Regarding claim 8, Seeley discloses camera devices can also detect voice information, combine voice data based on voice information with image data and transmit combined data (col. 2, lines 61-67; col. 18, lines 47-61).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lemelson (US 3,686,434) discloses an area surveillance system.

Seeley et al. (US 6,097,429) discloses a site control unit for video security system.

Bilder (US 6,359,557) discloses a monitoring and notification method and apparatus.

Chen (US 6,060,994) discloses a method for controlling united home security system.

Baxter, Jr. (US 6,023,223) discloses an early warning detection and notification network for environmental conditions.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Previl whose telephone number is 703 305-1028. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffery Hofsass can be reached on 305-4717. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872-9314 for regular communications and 703 872-9315 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-4700.

Daniel Previl
Examiner
Art Unit 2632

DP
September 10, 2002


DANIEL J. WU
Primary Examiner
9/29/02